

MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
July 7, 2004
Aeronautics Building
2700 East Airport Service Drive
Lansing, Michigan 48909

Meeting noticed in accordance with Open Meetings Act, Public Act 267 of 1976.

Present

Carmine Palombo, Chairman
John Kolessar, Member
Eric Swanson, Member
Susan Mortel, Member
Kirk Steudle, Member
Frank Kelley, Commission Advisor

Thomas Wieczorek, Vice Chairman
Aaron Hopper, Member
Bill McEntee, Member
Jerry Richards, Member
Steve Warren, Member

Absent

Richard Deuell, Member

Staff Present

Rick Lilly, Bureau of Transportation Planning
Rob Surber, Center for Geographic Information
Ron Vibbert, Bureau of Transportation Planning
Stacey Schafer, Bureau of Transportation Planning

Call to Order

Chairman Palombo called the meeting to order at 1:07pm.

Approval of the July 7th, 2004 Council Minutes

Rick Lilly presented the [July 7th, 2004 Council Minutes](#) for approval. Vice Chair Wieczorek moved for the approval of the minutes supported by Mr. Richards. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Correspondence and Announcements

Mr. Kelley informed the Council that the State Transportation Commission meeting for July will not be in the Aeronautics Building; rather it will be in the Chamber of Commerce Building in Detroit. Mr. Steudle represented Mr. Palombo at the last meeting.

Agency Reports

Mr. Palombo reported that regarding reauthorization Congress has come to no decision yet, but the conference committee seems to be coming together on a

number that is going to be around \$318 billion. The President has already indicated that he would veto this legislation. Ms. Mortel said that Governor Granholm and Senator Stabenow had a press conference on how Congress needs to act and pass the six year bill and funding fairness for Michigan.

Quarterly Report

Mr. Lilly presented the [Quarterly Report](#) to the Council. Mr. Lilly pointed out that the Communications Plan that was adopted is now out on the web for viewing. He further reported that through June 25, the Council has spent just under \$319,000.

Mr. Wieczorek moved for approval and Mr. Richards supported. The Quarterly Report was approved unanimously.

Committee Reports

Administrative and Education Committee (reported by Mr. Kolessar): Topic 1: Region 5

Mr. Kolessar reported that the committee had a request from Region 5 in terms of funding. Because of the fiscal year timing, Region 5 did not spend their '03 budget monies until after the end of the fiscal year and consequently this year they would run short. They have requested more funding. The committee discussed under what terms they would want to give relief of this sort. The committee examined all of their expenses and they were in line with Council's work plan. The committee felt that Region 5 spent their monies appropriately and should not be penalized. This situation was considered as a cost overrun and should be entertained as a one-time adjustment. It was recommended by the committee that Region 5 be given up to an additional \$15,000, for this year only.

Mr. Kolessar moved for approval and Mr. Wieczorek support. The motion was approved.

Topic 2 & 3: FY 06 Budget and Asset Management Brochure

The FY '06 budget as well as the Asset Management Brochure was discussed and the committee has some recommendations to be considered that will be discussed later in the meeting under another agenda item.

Data Management Committee (reported by Mr. McEntee): Topic 1: CGI Application Server

Mr. McEntee reported that the committee authorized CGI to set up an application server, hardware, and software for \$75,000 as an estimated amount. This will allow the Council to have a system in place to store data and be in a position to

develop the applications that we want to run on the server. There is money in this year's budget to begin development of the application in the amount of about \$100,000. That will provide for some of the support administration, data entry, and hardware and software. Application support is also needed.

The committee saw some examples of web based application using aerial photography developed for state agencies. This provided insight to the many different possibilities of taking a basic format and converting it into something that all 617 agencies could use to further their asset management activities. The committee supported this concept.

Topic 2: Survey

Mr. McEntee reported that the committee gave their approval to Mr. Vibbert for the data collection survey with local agencies, predominantly in the Saginaw/ Bay City region. Mr. Vibbert's staff is going to be contacting all of the road commissions, selected larger cities in that area, as well as MPO's. The survey will be conducted over the phone, asking detailed questions on the type of data they collect, how often they collect it, how they store it, etc. The committee is expecting a report in at least a month.

Topic 3: Training Opportunity

Mr. McEntee spoke about the different training opportunities that are coming up. There is a training session in Chicago on the HERS software program. Transportation Research Board is hosting a session on performance measures in Idaho in the near future.

Strategic Analysis Committee (reported by Mr. Warren):

Mr. Warren reported that the committee talked about a process for reviewing and demonstrating various strategic models. The committee talked about a process where they could look at different models to see what is out there without going through a formal Request for Proposal process at this point. The Michigan Department of Information Technology provided staff with background information on what process needed to be followed. They indicated that the Council we need to follow the formal established process in order to do this. There is going to be a meeting to discuss this process. The committee's hope is to have the companies in no later than October. At that time we would set a day aside and have individual presentations to the Council and then proceed from there.

Update on Training and Roadway Condition Data Collection - Ron Vibbert

Mr. Vibbert reported that six of the seven trainings sessions have been completed. One more is going to be held on July 21st in Saginaw. The collection

is expected to begin within the next couple of weeks. The Bay Region area will be the one area that will be held off for another two weeks because they have yet to receive training. The estimated time of completion for collection is November.

Asset Management Brochure – Stacey Schafer

Ms. Schafer informed the Council that the Strategic Analysis Committee received a rough draft of the brochure and at their last meeting. The committee made different suggestions regarding the content and the appearance of the brochure. We are looking to make about 2500 copies. The brochure will be posted on the internet. The intent of the brochure is to help the cities deal with what an asset management process is as they are looking to move their funds consistent with recent changes in state law. Changes will be made to the brochure dealing with color, picture organization, and formatting of the actual brochure before it is printed.

Mr. Kolessar moved for approval and Mr. McEntee supported. The brochure was approved as amended.

Pilot Project Selection Process - Rick Lilly

Mr. Lilly reported that he reviewed the Work Plan and found four different areas that he thought would be potential pilot projects. Mr. McEntee came up with a method of choosing different possible studies. Mr. Steudle raised the idea of producing a template for each agency to follow or refer to when collecting data. Mr. Steudle thought that we should let the regions know that we have the \$50,000 available to help regions do their roads. The Council decided to refer the Pilot Project options back to the Data Management Committee. The Data Management Committee is going to develop parameters that would allow the Council to send out a notice to the counties and cities that would let us collect data on the Non Federal Aid Road System.

The motion is to have the Data Management Committee work with staff to develop Pilot Projects not in excess of \$10,000 per project. Moved by Mr. Steudle, supported by Mr. Richards. The motion was approved.

Discussion on “maintenance”- Kirk Steudle

Mr. Steudle reported to the Council that when the Council had their planning session in December one of the things that was unclear was what was the actual definition of maintenance. This has yet to be covered and finished according to the Work Plan. There is an additional interest in the form of the Category D, funding through the Transportation Economic Development Fund. This category is used for bringing roads to all season status but doesn't include maintenance. This was done many years ago and the definition of maintenance has changed, but it is not reflected in this category. The Council should go on record as saying

that part of our annual plan says preventive maintenance is a way to keep good roads in good condition.

A committee is going to be established to address this issue with thoughts to incorporate what is in Act 51 now, and can it be broadened in the EDF so that more counties can qualify for funding on roads with some other projects. The Council would like to be kept informed of the progress of this committee. Mr. Steudle is going to speak with Jackie Shinn about this issue.

Draft 2006 Budget - Rick Lilly

Mr. Lilly indicated that all of the committees have had a chance to look at the budget and there are a series of things that have been raised at the committee level that the Council may want to change. There are also several significant changes that have been made to this budget compared to previous budgets.

Changes in the FY06 budget from previous budgets include the fact that this is the first budget that uses actual costs rather than estimates. We have increased the mileage from 43,000 to 54,000 miles on the federal aid eligible. This is not the mileage that we are going to collect data on; rather it is the actual number of miles we need to drive. Also, for the first time we have included funding for collecting condition data on 26,000 miles of local roads.

Further there has been an increase in the Data Collection Equipment line item which represents the process of beginning to replace half the computers that we have in the field. It was indicated in the very first budget that beginning in 2006 we would need various pilots to replace the equipment that we had put out in 2003. Additionally, \$250,000 has been added to the budget for Data Services. This is to cover potential pilot studies. The other category that was changed is instead of listing the Multi-year Program as a line item, it was changed to "MPO/RPA" line item so we can track better what it is actually costing us in terms of the contracts with them.

Changes discussed by the committees included the following items. The committees have indicated that we do not have funding in the FY '06 budget for a server, but that was taken care of in the Data Management Committee. We are going to move ahead with getting the server in this year's budget. The budget will need to include a \$100,000 in the 2006 budget to the Data Services to include this new server in the FY 06. The source of this would be the CGI contract. \$100,000 should also be added to the Data Agency Activities for support of this server.

Each committee has recognized that there is not enough money allotted for training. This should be brought up to \$50,000. There are also no monies in the budget for buying the software if a commercial model was picked for strategic analysis.

Training was increased to \$50,000 and Data Agency Activities was increased to \$200,000. MPO/RPA line needs to be reworded to add “program, reports, related activities” in parenthesis. The ending total of the budget is \$1,657,200.

Mr. Steudle moved for approval, supported by Mr. Wieczorek. The budget was approved as amended.

Presentation on Strategic Models - Rick Lilly

Mr. Lilly reported that the Strategic Analysis Committee has been very involved the discussion of the models. A chart was presented to the Council showing the five major models that are being used right now in Michigan and who is using them. Of the 120,000 total miles about 2/3 is currently covered by a pavement management system. However, only 98 of the 617 agencies indicated in last year’s survey that they were using some type of a pavement management system. Mr. Lilly further told the Council that there are three different states (Wisconsin, Washington, and California) that are doing something similar to what we in Michigan want to do. These three states mandate some form of a pavement management system. They all have a central organization which is made up of the states, cities, and counties working in a cooperative effort. In every instance they identify one single management system, but they do not mandate that everyone has to use that system. They do allow agencies to use something else and they have to be certified by the DOT that the management system is doing what they want it to do in order for agencies to use it. In every instance they allow local agencies to collect their own data and submit it to the central agency. Finally, two of the three have a central data agency that everyone must report to. The Council is on the right track with regards to best practices in other states.

Public Comment

Bob Slattery, Mayor of Mt. Morris and staff person with the Genesee County Road Commission, agreed with having pilot projects go back to the committees. Mr. Slattery had general questions about local roads for the Council to which they addressed.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:03 pm.

